FILED SUPREME COURT STATE OF WASHINGTON 5/29/2018 9:13 AM BY2SUSAN L. CARLSON			
3	CLERK		
4			
5			
6			
7	IN THE SUPREME COURT FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON		
8			
9	ALEXANDRA BRAATZ,) NO. 95747-9	
10	Respondent,		
11	v.)	SUPPLEMENTAL CITATION TO AUTHORITY	
12	MICHAEL BRAATZ,		
13	Petitioner.		
14			
15			
16	COMES NOW Michael Braatz, the petitioner, by and through his attorney, Neil M.		
17	Fox, and offers the following additional authority, regarding whether he ever "waived" the		
18	right to assert the Fifth Amendment in any future hearing:		
19	1. Stone v. State, 85 Wn.2d 342, 344, 534 P.2d 1022 (1975):		
20	The established rule is that a waiver of the privilege against self incrimination by testifying at one proceeding does not extend to a later,		
21	separate proceeding. [Citations omitted] this rule are various: that repetition adds	The reasons given by courts following	
22	increasing the self-incrimination danger; created new and greater dangers of prose	that changed circumstances may have	
23	proceeding may entail different procedure incriminatory disclosures. [Citations om	res, increasing the possibility of	
24	this result, it is clear that the vast majoristate and federal, have reached it.	ty of courts both ancient and modern,	
25		340 U.S. 367, 374, 71 S. Ct. 438, 95 L	
26	2. Rogers v. United States, 340 U.S. 367, 374, 71 S. Ct. 438, 95 L. Ed. 344 (1951):		
27	[T]he court was required to determine, as it must whenever the privilege is claimed, whether the question presented a reasonable danger of <i>further</i>		
28	crimination in light of all the circumstan disclosures. As to each question to which	ces, including any previous	

1	court must determine whether the answer to that particular question would subject the witness to a "real danger" of <i>further</i> crimination.	
2	Emphasis added.	
3	3. McCarthy v. Arndstein, 262 U.S. 355, 357-60, 43 S. Ct. 562, 67 L. Ed. 1023 (1923) (holding that when a witness's prayious disclosure is not an	
5	actual admission of guilt or incriminating facts, the witness subsequently may	
6	him: "And since we find that none of the answers which had been voluntarily given by Arndstein, either by way of denials or partial disclosures, amounted to	
7	an admission or showing of guilt, we are of opinion that he was entitled to decline to answer further questions when so to do might tend to incriminate him.")	
8		
9 10	4. Emspak v. United States, 349 U.S. 190, 198, 75 S. Ct. 687, 99 L. Ed. 997 (1955) (referring to the Court's "own oft-repeated admonition" that the courts must indulge every reasonable presumption against finding a testimonial various)	
	testimonial waiver)	
11	5. United States v. Licavoli, 604 F.2d 613, 623 (9th Cir. 1979) (holding that voluntary testimony before a grand jury did not waive the	
12 13	privilege at trial, because "[i]t is settled that a waiver of the Fifth Amendment privilege is limited to the particular proceeding in which the waiver occurs").	
14	Dated this 29 th day of May 2018.	
15	Respectfully submitted,	
16	s/ Neil M. Fox	
17	WSBA No. 15277 Attorney for Petitioner	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
2627		
27		
20		

LAW OFFICE OF NEIL FOX PLLC

May 29, 2018 - 9:13 AM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court: Supreme Court

Appellate Court Case Number: 95747-9

Appellate Court Case Title: Alexandra Braatz v. Michael Braatz

Superior Court Case Number: 16-2-07697-1

The following documents have been uploaded:

• 957479_State_of_Add_Authorities_20180529091044SC239677_5500.pdf

This File Contains:

Statement of Additional Authorities

The Original File Name was SUPPLEMENTAL CITATION TO AUTHORITY 052918.pdf

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- adrienne.mckelvey@foster.com
- braunlaw@comcast.net
- dward@LegalVoice.org
- jackie.schafer@gmail.com
- kim.clark1022@yahoo.com
- litdocket@foster.com
- markf@nwjustice.org

Comments:

Sender Name: Neil Fox - Email: nf@neilfoxlaw.com

Address:

2125 WESTERN AVE STE 330

SEATTLE, WA, 98121 Phone: 206-728-5440

Note: The Filing Id is 20180529091044SC239677